

Application No. 10/053,720  
Amendment dated December 15, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

**Amendments to the Claims:**

Please amend claims 1, 5, 6 and 12.

Please cancel claims 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Please add new claims 21, 22, 23 and 24.

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings of claims in the application:

**Listing of Claims:**

---

Claim 1 (currently amended). An apparatus for reclaiming concrete, comprising:

a hopper with water means for introducing water to the hopper;

a separator having an inlet for receiving material from the hopper and a passageway for axially flowing the material therethrough;

~~a rotatable screen positioned in the separator;~~

a first outlet for removing material from the separator; ~~and~~

a second outlet for removing material from the separator; and

a rotatable screen positioned in the passageway of the separator to screen the axially flowing material by allowing material smaller than a predetermined size to pass through the screen and to flow to the second outlet and preventing material larger than a predetermined size from passing through the screen to form screened out material, the rotatable screen further being positioned so as to centrifugally direct the screened out material to the first outlet as the rotatable screen rotates.

Application No. 10/053,720  
Amendment dated December 15, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

Claim 2 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a pump for pumping material from the hopper to the separator.

191  
Claim 3 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the water means includes a water pump for pumping water to the hopper.

Claim 4 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising driving means for driving the rotatable screen.

Claim 5 (currently amended). The apparatus of claim 1, ~~further including means for centrifugally directing material in the separator towards the first outlet~~ wherein the passageway of the separator is substantially vertical and the rotatable screen has a screening surface which is substantially horizontal, the rotatable screen being positioned so as to centrifugally direct the screened out material towards the first outlet by flowing the material on the screening surface.

Claim 6 (currently amended). The apparatus of claim 1, ~~further comprising means for screening out material larger than a predetermined size in the separator~~ wherein the first outlet is between the inlet and the rotatable screen and the second outlet is downstream of the rotatable screen.

Application No. 10/053,720

Amendment dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

Claim 7 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the rotatable screen includes apertures of a predetermined size.

191  
Claim 8 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, further comprising a sand tank for receiving material from the second outlet of the separator.

Claim 9 (original). The apparatus of claim 8, further comprising:  
a first water holding tank; and  
a separator outlet line connecting the first water holding tank to the separator.

Claim 10 (original). The apparatus of claim 9, further comprising a first water holding tank outlet in the bottom section of the first water holding tank.

Claim 11 (original). The apparatus of claim 9, further comprising:  
a second water holding tank; and  
a first water holding tank outlet line connecting the second water holding tank to the first water holding tank.

Application No. 10/053,720

Amendment dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

Claim 12 (currently amended).      ~~The~~ An apparatus of claim 11, further for reclaiming concrete,  
comprising:

a hopper with water means for introducing water to the hopper;

a separator having an inlet for receiving material from the hopper;

a rotatable screen positioned in the separator;

a first outlet for removing material from the separator;

a second outlet for removing material from the separator;

a sand tank for receiving material from the second outlet of the separator;

a first water holding tank;

a separator outlet line connecting the first water holding tank to the separator;

a second water holding tank;

a first water holding tank outlet line connecting the second water holding tank to the first  
water holding tank;

a third water holding tank; and

a second water holding tank outlet line connecting the third water holding tank to the second  
water holding tank.

Application No. 10/053,720

Amendment dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

Claim 13 (original). The apparatus of claim 12, further comprising:

a fourth water holding tank; and

a third water holding tank outlet line connecting the fourth water holding tank to the third water holding tank.

191  
Claim 14 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, further including a water pump for pumping water to the separator.

Claim 15 (original). The apparatus of claim 1, further including a baffle disposed in the hopper, the baffle having an aperture of a predetermined size.

Claim 16 (cancelled).

Claim 17 (cancelled).

Claim 18 (cancelled).

Claim 19 (cancelled).

Claim 20 (cancelled).

Application No. 10/053,720

Amendment dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

Claim 21 (new). The apparatus of claim 12, further comprising a pump for pumping material from the hopper to the separator.

19 Claim 22 (new). The apparatus of claim 12, wherein the water means includes a water pump for pumping water to the hopper.

Claim 23 (new). The apparatus of claim 12, further comprising driving means for driving the rotatable screen.

Claim 24 (new). The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the screen is positioned in the passageway so as not to allow the material to pass through the passageway without being screened.

---

Application No. 10/053,720

Amendment dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

cylindrical surface. It screens material flowing radially and not axially. Further, in the cited references, the screened out material is not centrifugally directed to the first outlet. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended should be allowable.

Claim 2 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because it discloses a pump for pumping material from the hopper to the separator. Nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia such elements.

Claim 3 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

Claim 4 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia such elements.

Claim 5 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because it discloses a passageway of the separator which is substantially vertical and the rotatable screen has a screening surface which is substantially horizontal, the rotatable screen being positioned so as to centrifugally direct the screened out material towards the first outlet by flowing the material on the screening surface. Nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia such elements.

Claim 6 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because it discloses the first outlet being between the inlet and the rotatable screen and the second outlet being downstream of the rotatable screen. Nothing in the cited references teaches,

Application No. 10/053,720  
Amendment dated December 15, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

discloses or suggests inter alia such elements.

Claim 7 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because it discloses an apparatus having a rotatable screen that includes apertures of a predetermined size. Nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia such elements.

Claim 8 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

Claim 9 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 8. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

Claim 10 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 9. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

Claim 11 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 9. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

Claim 14 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.



Application No. 10/053,720  
Amendment dated December 15, 2003  
Reply to Final Office Action mailed on September 15, 2003

Claim 15 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 1. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

New claim 24 should be allowable because it is dependent on allowable claim 1. Further, it should be allowable because it discloses a screen being positioned in the passageway so as not to allow the material to pass through the passageway without being screened. Nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia such elements.

#### **Objection of Claims 12 and 13**

Claims 12 and 13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 12 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and should be allowable.

Claim 13 should be allowable because it is depended on allowable claim 12. Further it should be allowable because nothing in the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests inter alia the elements of this claim.

#### **Withdrawal of Claims 16-20**

Applicant confirms the election of the claims as made by the examiner and does not object to the withdrawal of claims 16-20. Applicant, however, reserves the right to claim the matter disclosed in claims 16-20 in further related patent applications.